DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 471 559 SP 041 269

AUTHOR	Gendernalik-Cooper, Mary
TITLE	A Multi-Faceted Assessment System in a Collaborative Educator Preparation Model: Performance, Processes, Programs.
PUB DATE	2002-00-00
NOTE	50p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (55th, New Orleans, LA, January 24-27, 2003).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Accreditation (Institutions); College School Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Institutional Evaluation; Partnerships in Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Professional Development Schools; *Program Evaluation; Student Teacher Evaluation; Teacher Certification

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the development of a comprehensive assessment system within a school-university educator preparation collaborative, detailing the evidence sources used in relation to the three categories into which the assessment system is organized (performance, process, and program). The Professional Development School Network (PDSN) was created to replace traditional field experience placements. NCATE PDS draft standards framed the PDSN's development. Four school systems collaborated to select 28 participating PDSs. Throughout the program, student teachers worked with widely diverse student populations in urban, suburban, and rural PDSs. The paper reviews the assessment system in relation to evaluation and inquiry and informing and transforming practice. It considers challenges faced by accredited educator preparation programs and comprehensive assessment systems. It concludes by explaining that through this assessment, data from multiple sources affirm and substantiate evaluative judgments regarding candidates' performance, program quality, and process effectiveness. The assessment system facilitates critical review of the unit's work in relation to clearly articulated standards and in light of performance based evidence. Four appendixes present the 2002 PDSN profile; impacting student learning components, schedule, rubric sample data, spring 2002; apprentice mid-term and final evaluation summaries; and PDSN self-study 2000, composite summary scores for PDS functions and NCATE draft standards. (Contains 30 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mary Gerderdik-Cooper

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

A MULTI-FACETED ASSESSMENT SYSTEM in a COLLABORATIVE EDUCATOR PREPARATION MODEL: Performance, Processes, Programs

ED 471 559

With the adoption of the NCATE 2000 Standards, comprehensive systemic assessment has become an explicit requirement of nationally accredited educator preparation units. As noted in the standard statement: "The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on the applicant qualifications, the candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs." (NCATE 2000 Unit Standards, pg. 1) The standard clearly identifies the interrelated categories to which the assessment system must attend: performance, processes, and programs. The elements of these categories are illuminated in a close reading of the other standards and the accompanying explanations contained in the standards document.

Regarding performance, the assessment system must collect and analyze evidence of pre-admission applicants' ability, admitted candidates' knowledge, skills, dispositions, and ability to impact P-12 students' learning, and faculty (both university and school-based) performance in relation to program implementation, candidate learning and achievement. Process focused assessment must monitor and gauge the effect and efficacy of activities and formal procedures on candidate performance, program implementation and collaboration among university based teacher educators, arts and sciences faculty, and school-based P-12 practitioners including faculty and administrators. Program assessment focuses on content, the enactment of the curriculum, field experiences, and their integration, as well as their alignment with the program's

SP 041269

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

explicit standards. Program assessment also attends to the defining of tasks that link the curriculum and program expectations to candidate performances and the rubrics for evaluating those performances. The assessment related language of the NCATE 2000 Unit Standards document defies the reductionist inclination of current federal policy to judge candidate proficiencies and program/unit effectiveness in producing competent education professionals by the performance of candidates on a single standardized test. Indeed the NCATE standard expects units to develop and employ a system of multiple indicators of performance proficiencies, program and process effectiveness. This expectation reflects the well-substantiated convictions regarding the complex nature of teaching, and the absolute necessity of deliberate, coherent integration of the content, pedagogy, and application components of professional preparation programs.

As is evident in the series of papers commissioned by NCATE in relation to Standard 2 (see Stiggins 2000, Scannell 2000,Weisenbach 2000, Stroble 2000) the processes and considerations inherent in developing an assessment system are complex, extensive and intensive, and likely to challenge longstanding institutional and faculty traditions. Stiggens, for example, notes that assessment is often a neglected element of teacher preparation programs, both in terms of such programs having coherent, comprehensive assessment systems in place and with regard to adequately preparing candidates for the assessment activities in which teachers regularly engage. He, Weisenbach and Stroble all note that the culture of teaching in higher education is essentially autonomous and private. A system of assessment will require considerable faculty collaboration, with each other and with school-based colleagues. It requires articulating a common vision of expectations, a shared set of achievement standards for

candidates, and working simultaneously toward a coherent vision of the program as a whole and a shared understanding of the contributions distinct pieces make to enact that vision. The entire range of key stakeholders must be engaged in developing and implementing the assessment system, utilizing the evidence it generates, and contributing to its on-going improvement. Weisenbach recommends building the assessment system around the unit's conceptual framework and clearly articulated standards. These form the foundation of the assessment system and the bridges across the performance, process, and program categories. She and Stroble both note the potential that building and utilizing such assessment systems might hold for cultivating communities of inquiry involving candidates as well as university and school-based faculty within the unit. These authors further note that in addition to meeting the NCATE 2000 Standards, comprehensive assessment systems can provide education units with considerably more substantive, valid and reliable evidence that they are effectively preparing candidates for the complex responsibilities and challenges of teaching.

The balance of this paper examines the development of a comprehensive assessment system within a school-university educator preparation collaborative; detailing the evidence sources used in relation to the three categories—performance, process, and program—into which the assessment system is organized. It then reviews the assessment system in relation to evaluation and inquiry, informing and transforming practice. It concludes with consideration of challenges faced by accredited educator preparation programs and comprehensive assessment systems.

Contextual Background

Like most NCATE accredited institutions, the educator preparation unit described in this paper resides in a Masters I (formerly regional comprehensive) public university. Teaching is the primary focus of the university and tenure line faculty traditionally carry a four-course teaching load per semester. Tenure line faculty in the educator preparation programs balance their load between course instruction and field-based responsibilities. The educator preparation collaborative encompasses the twelve certification programs offered through the Department of Teacher Development within the College of Education. It offers undergraduate majors with certification in Early Childhood Education (P-5) and Middle Grades Education (4-8). In cooperation with arts and sciences departments, it offers secondary certification (7-12 in Biology, Chemistry, English, History, Mathematics, Math/Physics, Political Science) and P-12 certification in foreign languages and music. Candidates in these programs complete majors in their content fields.

Between 1997and 1998 the department faculty in collaboration with arts and sciences colleagues and P-12 faculty and administrators undertook a comprehensive review of programs. This review revealed substantial lack of program coherence evidenced particularly by near total disconnect across the content, pedagogy, and field components of the programs. In Fall 1998 the initial phase of revisions in these certification programs was inaugurated. Simultaneously, a Professional Development School Network (PDSN) was collaboratively created to replace the traditional field experience placement process. The NCATE PDS Draft Standards (1997) were used to frame the Network's development. Four school systems jointly participated in the

selection of the 28 PDSs: 17 elementary schools, 6 middle schools, and 5 secondary schools from across the four systems. A central feature of the program revisions is that all field experiences in all of the certification programs occur in the PDSs. Course related field experiences are scheduled into a five-week block in the middle of the fifteen-week semester. During this period on-campus class meetings are suspended to facilitate faculty participation in the field experiences. Candidates also complete their culminating Apprenticeship (student teaching semester) in a PDS with a Network approved master teacher. Over the course of their programs candidates work in urban, suburban and rural PDSs with widely diverse student populations. (see PDS Network Profile in Appendix A)

The Conceptual Framework and Assessment System

"Understanding for Teaching, Teaching for Understanding" is the conceptual theme adopted for all educator preparation programs in the unit. The core conceptualizations of learning, teaching and assessing for understanding embodied by this theme were drawn primarily from the work of David Perkins, Vito Perrone, Martha Stone Wiske and their colleagues at Harvard University in Project Zero and the Teaching for Understanding Project (Wiske 1998). Key propositions and beliefs within this work resonate to program values and goals. These included the notions that teachers are the primary decision makers about curriculum, that learners must and do construct their own understandings, that understanding is the ability to think and act flexibly with what one knows, that performances represent the state and quality of understanding, and that assessment is an on-going disposition and perspective entailing the identification and application of criteria for defining, reviewing and evaluating performances of understanding rather than being thought of as a distinct performance, task or event. These

core concepts provide a common frame for the development of each certification program's curriculum, field experiences, and performance requirements.

A second commonality across the certification programs is the adoption of the ten INTASC Standards as the Conceptual Framework Principles (CFP) and primary outcome targets. Each program's curriculum was then developed reflecting appropriate distinctions related to content, content pedagogy, and developmental pedagogy. Table I summarizes the semester hour distribution for each program by these categories.

Table I
Distribution of Semester Hours in Educator Preparation Programs

Program	General Core Arts & Sciences	Major Specific Core A&S/Pedagogy	Upper Division Content	Upper Division Content Pedagogy	Upper Division Developmental Pedagogy
Early Childhood P-5	42	9/9	Two 12-15sh concentrations (Math & Reading)	12 6 each in science and social studies	6
Middle Grades 4-8	42	9/9	Two 12sh concentrations (Math, English, Social Studies, Science)	9 including reading diagnosis-remediation	12
Secondary 7-12	42	9/9	30 sh single subject major	6	6

Within each program, each course identifies its primary objectives in terms of the INTASC/Conceptual Framework Principle(s) most appropriate to its focus. There are no generic content pedagogy or developmental pedagogy courses in which students from different programs enroll together. Course work and field experiences are completely tailored to the content and/or grade level focus of each program. Performance requirements within each course are designed for candidates to demonstrate the developmental quality of their understandings and proficiencies in relation to the targeted principles. Each candidate constructs a portfolio, organized around the ten

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTASC/Conceptual Framework Principles, that evidences performances and related indicators of progress and proficiency.

Revising the programs and cultivating the collaborative processes and structures through which they are enacted have followed an emergent progression over the past four years. The same is true of the process through which the assessment system has developed. Efforts have been guided by commitments to coherence, authenticity, legitimacy and comprehensiveness (Lather 1986, Lieberman 1988, 1992, Little 1988, Perrone 1991, Gitlin 1992, Wiggins 1995, Joyce & Showers 1996, Schalock 1998, Schon 1991).

Program revisions, performance expectations and processes for decision--making and program implementation and the assessment system are being enacted within this conceptual theme and a framework of standards. In addition to the INTASC and NCATE standards this work is informed by consideration of standards, principles and guidelines promulgated by national professional societies such as ACEI, NAEYC, NMSA; content specific professional societies including NCSS, NCTM, NCTE, NSTA, AAAS; the state certification agency's standards and the university system's Regents' Principles and Guidelines for Educator Preparation. The NCATE PDS Standards—both the 1997 Draft Standards and the 2001 adopted version—figure prominently in the design, implementation and assessment of the PDSN as both a process and program component.

There are currently 30 distinct evidence sources in the assessment system. Each is identified in Table II in relation to the category(ies) to which it is linked. Notations indicate the frequency of data collection from each source and their relative significance in the assessment of a given category. Among the evidence sources there is considerable

variability in their activation. The PDS Perceptual Survey, for example, has been in use since the first semester, fall 1998, of implementation of the program revisions and PDSN; there now exists eight semesters worth of data from this survey. By contrast the Employer Satisfaction Survey was first piloted in spring 2002. A more extensive explanation of each category of the assessment system and its primary evidence sources is provided below.

Table II
Comprehensive Assessment Framework

Evidence Sources	Performance\Frequency	Process\Frequency	Program\Frequency
Course Performance Assessment	C 1 \Semester		1 \Annually
Lab Assessment	C 1 \Semester		1 \Annually
Professional Qualities	C 1 \Semester		1 \Annually
ISL	C 1 \Semester		1 \Annually
Intervention	C 2 \As Needed	1 \Annually	1 \Annually
Candidate Portfolio	C 1 \Semester		2 \Annually
Apprentice Assessment	C 1 \Semester		1 \Annually
PRAXIS II Scores	C 2 \Annually		2 \Annually
Guarantee Referrals	C 2 \Annually		1 \Annually
Course Evaluation	F 2 \Semester		
Tenure & Promotion	F 1 \As Appropriate		2 \Annually
Master Teacher Evaluation	F 2 \Semester	1 \Annually	2 \Annually
University Coord. Evaluation	F 1 \Semester	1 \Annually	1 \Annually
Building Coord. Evaluation	F 2 \Semester	1 \Annually	2 \Annually
P-12 State Report Card	S 2 \Annually	2 \Annually	2 \Annually
PDS Perception Survey		1 \Semester	2 \Annually
Candidate Satisfaction Survey		2 \Annually	2 \Annually
Graduate Satisfaction Survey		2 \Annually	2 \Annually
Employment Rates			2 \Annually
Employer Satisfaction Survey		2 \Annually	2 \Annually
Master Teacher Selection		1 \Annually	1 \Annually
Professional Development Participation		1 \Annually	1 \Annually
PDSNI Meeting notes		1 \Annually	1 \Annually
PDS continuation		1 \Annually	2 \Annually
PDS Inquiry Year		1 \Annually•	2 \Annually•
PDS Review & Renewal Year		1 \Annually•	2 \Annually•
Regents' Annual Review		2 \Annually	1 \Annually
Program Folio Review			1 \Every 5 years
NCATE Accreditation		1 \Every 5 years	2 \Every 5 years
Program Enrollment Patterns		2 \Biennially	2 \Biennially

Key: C=educator preparation candidate; F=PDSNI faculty; S=P-12 students; 1=primary significance; 2=secondary significance; •=within the overall four year cycle, each PDS does a formal Inquiry in the third year of its cycle and a Review and Renewal Year in the fourth year of the cycle. Frequency indicates the timeframe of data collection.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Performance Assessments

The performance category includes evidence sources related to educator candidates, university and P-12 faculty who participate in the educator preparation programs, and P-12 students who attend the PDSs. Fifteen of the thirty evidence sources relate to this category; nine of these relate to educator preparation candidates. The first four—course performance assessment, lab assessment, professional qualities, ISL—encompass candidate performance in program course work and integrated field experiences (labs). As noted previously the ten INTASC Standards were adopted for all educator preparation programs and adapted as primary objectives in courses. Within each course performance requirements are keyed to the INTASC Standard they address. The faculty has adopted a four point scale reflecting a common evaluation rubric for scoring performances. Each course performance assessment summarizes each candidate's performance score for each course objective. At the end of each semester, faculty members submit a course performance assessment summary on each candidate to a secured electronic data file. The electronic files can be aggregated by course, by INTASC/Conceptual Framework Principle, by candidate cohorts, and by program to provide various representations of performance assessment. As candidates proceed through the program they can review their course performance assessments with their advisors to clarify areas needing improvement, more attention, fullerdocumentation, etc. Candidates include evidence from specific course performances in their portfolios, which are organized by the ten INTASC/Conceptual Framework Principles. These become the evidentiary basis for evaluating candidates' programmatic progress and their proficiency on each standard/principle.

As part of the revision process that preceded the fall 1998 program implementation, university and school-based faculty worked collaboratively to improve the integration of field experiences with courses, in part, through the alignment of performance tasks and course objectives. Course syllabi revisions reflected a commitment to the lab experiences as the opportunity for candidates to critically apply classroom knowledge, strategies, and propositions regarding teaching and learning. The strategy adopted across courses and programs to convey the significance of lab performance expectations was to ensure that students had to perform satisfactorily in the lab in order to pass the course. Faculty configured the relative weight of graded assignments to reflect this requirement. Through this strategy school-based application and related reflection performances were more rigorously structured and gained considerable significance with candidates.

The introduction of the Impacting Student Learning (ISL) component into each program in Fall 2001 further structured and focused the lab performance expectations. Appendix B summarizes the current versions of the ISL elements, scoring rubric and form, and a table showing the distribution of ISL requirements within each program. Although candidates include evidence of student learning and achievement in their completed ISLs, the evaluation of the candidate's performance on an ISL is not reduced to specific evidence of gains by the P-12 students. In designing the ISL faculty were deliberate to avoid that distortive reductionism. They were intent on helping candidates link their instructional planning and delivery to evidence of student progress and achievement, and then to reflect on these integrated elements of instruction/learning to inform their self-evaluations and subsequent iterations of instructional planning and

action. Reflections on the preliminary ISLs by both candidates and faculty indicate that they enrich candidates' comprehension of each element of the complexity of teaching (clarifying instructional goals, understanding content as curriculum with sufficient depth and facility to select materials, strategies and sequences of activities with the goals and knowledge of their students as learners in mind, planning assessments that align with these other elements), their interactions and interdependence. The anecdotal evidence accumulated from the first two semesters of implementation indicates the ISL shifts candidates' focus from themselves as "students"—meeting requirements and the expectations of others—to their students. Candidates are increasingly focused, even those in the first semester of the program, on the impact their efforts are having on their P-12 students' learning and achievement—a pivotal performance expectation of the program. The ISLs include evidence of P-12 student learning and achievement as the sampled data summaries in Appendix B illustrate. Assessment of candidate performance and effectiveness has not, however, been reduced to this single measure.

The "lab" teacher with whom a candidate has worked during the intensive five-week field experience completes the Lab Assessment and Professional Qualities instruments. The Lab Assessment instrument provides a holistic rating of the candidates' performance in the classroom in relation to the targeted INTASC/Conceptual Framework Principles. It also includes indicators of the candidate's oral and written language skills. These scores are notated in the course performance assessment data set. The Professional Qualities data are maintained in the candidate's file, primarily for use by the candidate and his/her advisor. This data set has not yet been formally compiled for aggregation to cohort or program level, although it could be quite readily.

The Apprentice Assessment instrument summarizes the candidate's and his/her master teacher's evaluation of performances within the intensive culminating semester. The instrument's categories and items are keyed to the INTASC Standards and the same four-point scale for scoring performances that is used in course work is used here. Candidates and their master teachers each complete the form at mid-term and semester's end. The completed instrument reflects an Apprentice portfolio in which the candidate has included performance evidence of progress and proficiency. Appendix C includes summary data from a random sample of Apprentices' mid-term and final evaluation scores.

Interventions are formal procedures undertaken to encourage and support candidates identified with significant professional qualities or course/lab performance difficulties. The intervention reflects counseling with the candidate, a plan and timeline for addressing the difficulties, and indicators for determining successful resolution. Interventions are maintained in the candidate's file. At the end of each semester the department chair and faculty summarize the status of each intervention. The data set indicates any patterns of difficulties, origins (class or lab), numbers of interventions and successful resolutions by candidate, cohort, and program. With regard to the performance assessment category this data set reveals candidate's relative success with owning, acting on and resolving a difficulty that is perceived by faculty to warrant formal deliberate attention. Candidates are counseled that what they do to address and resolve an intervention is the most critical issue, not that an intervention has been initiated.

In Spring 2001 the educator preparation programs discussed in this paper began implementation of the university system's requirement of the "graduate guarantee". The

performance expectations and rubric in the guarantee mirror the INTASC/Conceptual Framework Principles; a set of procedures for referral by principals also is spelled out in the guarantee document. There have been no referrals to date, which is, itself, one form of data. Should referrals be made the procedure will allow for collecting data on areas of deficiency that can be linked to program elements and to the individual's performance record while in the program.

It should be noted that faculty have not relinquished fundamental course and instructional prerogatives. Individual faculty continue to organize course content, set objectives, determine materials to be used, and plan performance tasks that will figure into the end of course summative evaluation of candidates. Each instructor continues to determine the weight each such task will carry into the final calculation of a course grade and proficiency scores. Review of syllabi reveals a wide range of performances including traditional tests, essays, research projects, as well as artifacts of varied application tasks. The adoption of the common elements—weighting the lab experience requirements, the ISL outline, rubric, and inclusion pattern, the adoption of a common scoring scale, the utilization of the course performance assessment for data compilation—reflects a collegial effort to clarify and connect curriculum components of programs. These commonalities facilitate communication and comprehension among all participants: P-12 and university-based faculty, and candidates. They are a consequence of deliberate faculty collaboration in pursuit of more transparent program coherence. This work reflects the type of transformation Stiggens (2000) suggests will attend to development of a fully integrated assessment system. It has altered relationships between P-12 and university faculty but not in the detrimental way projected in some of

the literature on school—university partnerships (Stoddard 1993, Bulloch, et al. 1997, Tom 1998).

The PRAXIS II exam is required not by the program but by the state for certification. One difficulty with using PRAXIS II scores as a primary performance measure is that in all but one program the required exams focus exclusively on content preparation. The state does not require completion of the pedagogy/learning tests in the PRAXIS II series for certification, so those components of the educator preparation programs are not considered in this high-stakes certification requirement. The most compelling limitation of using PRAXIS II scores as a performance measure is that it does not authentically articulate to instructional practice. Nevertheless review of cohort performance and subtest scoring patterns on PRAXIS II can contribute to program review particularly with regard to alignments between the exam and pertinent components of the curriculum—in terms of both what each addresses and how it does so.

The evidence sources included for university-based faculty assessments include the annual departmental evaluation, which is based on individual faculty reports of progress and achievement in the areas of teaching, service, and professional development. Evidence includes exemplars of scholarship, course and curriculum development, and course evaluations completed for every course taught during the academic year. It also includes documentation of work in the PDSN. These procedures comply with university-wide faculty performance evaluation policies. The university formally recognizes the collaborative work of faculty in the PDSN as well. This work includes university coordinator functions, school-based inquiry projects, participation on school-based

committees, work with PDS faculty on particular professional development activities, and instruction with candidates during the five-week lab experiences each semester.

The university coordinator evaluation is used for faculty with formal liaison responsibilities in the PDSN. This evaluation instrument has a parallel version for PDS-based building coordinators. Items on the instrument reflect the jointly determined expectations for these roles. Educator preparation candidates and lab teachers, as well as role counterparts complete this evaluation instrument each semester. They are collected and compiled by the department chair. For university-based faculty the data from this evaluation are used in the annual performance evaluation. A procedure for formal and systematic review of the building coordinators based on data generated from this instrument has not yet been developed. Individual PDS building coordinators and their university coordinator counterpart have informally reviewed the data and used it in refining their work in this role. Similarly, the department chair reviews the data for indicators of problems and concerns that might need to be addressed. This dimension of the performance assessment clearly requires further development.

The Master Teacher Evaluation examines the master teacher's performance along three dimensions: modeling research-informed best practices; ability to mentor, support and evaluate the educator preparation candidate's performance; on-going active engagement in professional development. The master teacher evaluation process was initiated by the first cohort of master teachers in fall 1998. It has been tailored and refined within each program by master teachers in conjunction with university faculty (see Thompson 2001). It serves as the basis for teachers maintaining their master teacher designation.

Currently, the data set related to P-12 student performance in the assessment framework is limited to the annual "State Report Card", and then only the section reporting criterion-referenced test data. The CRCT is an evaluation linked to the state's Quality Core Curriculum, the document which outlines achievement targets by subject area and grade level and around which teachers/schools are required to build their instructional programs (see PDSN Profile, Appendix A). The state requires and administers a commercially available norm-referenced test to all K-8 students. By their nature these are not tests that should be used to evaluate teacher performance or effectiveness. Furthermore, during the last two academic years 1999-2000 and 2000-2001, neither the State Department of Education nor the test vendor could/would validate the test results. Classroom specific documentation of instructional effectiveness constitutes the main source of data on student performance. For education preparation candidates the Impacting Student Learning components that they complete each semester constitute their primary evidence of influencing student achievement.

Process Assessment

Developing comprehensive and coherent collaborative procedures through which university and school-based faculty would equitably participate in educator preparation has been as much a goal of this initiative as has been improvements in program content and candidate performance. Monitoring and gauging the extent to which processes and procedures are effectively addressing all three goals are the focus of the process category of the assessment system. With regard to the role enactment evidence sources (master teacher, university and building coordinators) the process assessment focus relates to how effectively these roles serve to link the university and school-based components of the

programs; how well do these roles facilitate substantive communication, problem-solving and collaborative action with regard to both program implementation and candidate performance. The perceptual and satisfaction survey data sources provide indirect indicators of process effectiveness. In the first two semesters of PDSN implementation, for example, consistent negative responses by both candidates and lab teachers to an item regarding whether or not everyone was adequately informed about course requirements, prompted a review of these procedures by building and university coordinators. The review eventuated in procedural changes that subsequent survey data indicate everyone finds more satisfactory.

Evidence sources that relate directly to PDSN operating procedures include the PDS Perception Survey, the Master Teacher Selection, PDSNI meeting notes, the comprehensive PDSN self-evaluation completed in spring 2000, the PDS Inquiry, Review and Renewal documents as well as a number of satisfaction surveys. As these collaboratively developed procedures are enacted, meetings and informal communications afford participants opportunities to endorse continuation, identify difficulties and challenges, and suggest changes. Maintenance of meeting and communication records provides an evidence base for reviewing and revising procedures as the PDSN evolves. One example in this area relates to the equitable representation of stakeholders on the university's primary policy body for educator preparation programs. For two years after the PDSN began functioning the Teacher Education Council included only one teacher and an administrator from the PDSs. PDS university coordinators and building coordinators formulated a proposal that the Council should include teacher/administrator representation from elementary, middle, and secondary levels. The

Council and university adopted the proposal in Spring 2002, resulting in increased P-12 representation including six representatives from three grade level groupings (Elementary, Middle, Secondary), and a practitioner in special education.

At the end of the second full year of implementation, spring of 2000, each of the 28 PDSs undertook a self-evaluation using the NCATE Draft Standards to organize their documentation of activities, strategies and practices. Once compiled by the PDSNI evaluator these data served as the basis for an overall self-evaluation. This self-study allowed us to gauge progress in the initiative against a relatively constant set of benchmarks. It also accommodated reviewing our work in relation to a broader national perspective on PDS work. Even at this early stage of implementation, this self-evaluation revealed considerable strength in the functional area of collaborative educator preparation. The preponderance of positive evidence related to this PDS function and its related standards. This was expected, as educator preparation was the primary focus of our collaborative work during this period. The professional development function emerged as the second strongest functional area in the self-evaluation. As faculty in the PDSN began working more closely with university faculty and educator preparation candidates they began to identify a professional development agenda for themselves. The PDSN sponsored workshops, seminars, and meetings to address this agenda. PDSN faculty also began to connect other school system-based professional development support to their PDS work. One of the dominant themes of the self-evaluation was the increased integration of educator preparation into the mainstream professional culture of each PDS.

While the PDS faculties acknowledged in the self-evaluation that their students' academic achievement is their priority and they could point to considerable evidence of effort in this regard, they noted that they had not directly connected it to their PDS roles. Many noted that completing this self-evaluation had brought the connections between this function and the educator preparation function into focus. The self-evaluation also revealed a consistent dearth of evidence related to the inquiry function of the PDS. Each PDS also provided evidence of work on each of the then five standards in the NCATE PDS Draft Standards framework. These data were compiled to create a PDSN status snapshot. Three individuals reviewed the evidence set separately and generated a composite rating for each standard. They then reviewed their ratings together and came to consensus. The rating summary is provided in Appendix D. A narrative explaining the basis for each rating was generated and shared with the PDSN. From Network members' collective review a follow-up agenda for the PDSN was formulated. A key element of that agenda was the creation of a formal four-year cycle of participation in the PDSN, which would include an Inquiry Year, and a Review and Renewal Year. The Inquiry Year would eventuate in each PDS pursuing a formal exploration of a topic or issue of interest to it, engaging faculty, administrators, university colleagues and educator preparation candidates in the process. It would formally encourage the inquiry function of PDS and situate it within the work and concerns of each PDS faculty. The Review and Renewal Year requires that each PDS continuously maintain evidence of its work in relation to the NCATE PDS Standards and that it formally review that evidence every four years to evaluate itself as a PDS. Based on its review, the PDS would determine if it wanted to continue in the PDSN and identify a self-improvement agenda for the next

four--year cycle. During Spring 2002 the PDSN generated a cycle structure that would begin in fall 2002 with approximately one-quarter of the PDSs situated in each of the four years of the cycle.

Through process assessment deliberate reflective attention is paid to the effects procedures and processes are having on candidate performance and program implementation. Process assessment also can illuminate the extent to which procedures and activities are supporting or inhibiting genuine collaboration among P-12 and higher education participants in the PDSN.

Program Assessment

The program category of the assessment system focuses on the outcome standards, understandings, skills, dispositions and results that candidates are expected to achieve and that procedures and processes are intended to cultivate. Program reviews by external evaluators (e.g. national professional societies, the state certification agency, and the Regents' Principles and Guidelines for Educator Preparation) constitute a major evidence source for program assessment. These reviews attend to evidence in course syllabi and sequences, of program coherence, depth, and comprehensiveness, alignment of program content with relevant scholarship, and, increasingly, evidence of program impact on candidate performances in relation to P-12 student achievement.

Candidate performance evidence sources constitute a primary basis for program assessment, linking by inference candidates' course and lab performance evaluations to program quality and/or effect. Review of course performance assessment data and candidates' portfolios figure prominently here. Candidates are expected to include in the portfolio actual performance evidence (an essay, a lesson or unit plan, a presentation

outline, a critical reflection on a lesson taught in lab) from graded course assignments, which the course instructor has keyed to one or more of the INTASC/Conceptual Framework Principles. A major challenge related to this component of program assessment is moving to a more direct examination of the course tasks and activities that form the basis for the candidates' performance evaluations in relation to the INTASC/CFP they are purported in the course syllabus to address. Such an exercise might exemplify the departure from tradition Stiggins (2000, pg. 20-21) asserts is embedded in authentic program assessment.

The various perception and satisfaction surveys provide a continuous stream of evidence regarding participants' views of program objectives, elements, and effects. The PDS Perception Survey includes a number of items related to integration of the class and field experience components of courses and the programs overall. The data set, which now includes eight successive administrations of the survey, indicates consistently strong positive perceptions of this integration across all participant groups. These items have been monitored closely, particularly in semesters when program refinements have been initiated. The employer satisfaction survey and the graduate satisfaction survey include items correlated to program adopted INTASC/Conceptual Framework Principles. The surveys attempt to gauge program effects by exploring respondents' assessment of graduates' performance effectiveness in relation to these principles. Data from the pilot survey of employers suggest above average satisfaction with graduates' performance on items related to all ten INTASC/Conceptual Framework Principles. The strongest scores were on content knowledge and instruction (INTASC/CFP 1 &7), and in meeting students' developmental needs (INTASC/CFP 2). Scores did not vary significantly

across grade levels or school type: PDS and non-PDS. Over time the data stream from these surveys should inform the assessment of program impact on the professional practices of graduates. The assessment of graduates' effectiveness vis a vis program preparation is constrained by the extent to which the professional culture of the schools in which they are employed supports and nurtures practices that are grounded in that preparation. Additional strategies for investigating this alignment need to be developed.

Referrals (or the lack thereof) under the terms of the guarantee also can be used as evidence of program effectiveness. None-the-less, more direct methods of assessing program impact on the teaching practices of graduates need to be developed, implemented, and integrated into the overall assessment system.

Analysis

The assessment system described in the preceding section of this paper is evolving in concert with on-going refinements in the educator preparation programs, cultivation of genuine university-school collaboration, and enhancements of candidate proficiencies in supporting student learning. Each of these categories is inherently complex. Their simultaneous pursuit can be overwhelming. Experience in this initiative suggests a dynamic complementarity and mutually supporting momentum between and across the categories with the assessment system serving as bridge and bond. The assessment system continues to be emergent in nature, prompted by questions, issues, concerns, and opportunities that themselves emerge in program enactment and collaborative activities. In this regard the assessment system is as much an opportunity for inquiry and professional development as for evaluation. It serves to both inform and transform practice, particularly with regard to educator preparation. But its utility in

transforming P-12 teaching practices, expanding teachers' participation in decision making and enriching their professional development agenda is becoming increasingly evident.

Assessment as Evaluation and as Inquiry

In a traditional vein assessment is generally thought of as distinct and deliberate activities or events undertaken to provide evidence of accomplishment or achievement and a basis for a qualitative evaluation of that evidence. In recent years considerable professional attention has been paid to the form that assessment activities take, particularly with respect to the extent to which the assessment activity aligns both with the type of learning it is expected to evidence and with as authentic a demonstration of the learning in action as possible. In educator preparation this concern is evident in expectations (both internal and external) that candidates demonstrate proficiency in instruction related tasks (e.g. instructional planning, execution, evaluation, revision; classroom management; effective work with students of diverse backgrounds; collegial professional traits) and in affecting their students' learning and achievement.

Within the system described in this paper, candidates' performances in relation to program standards (INTASC) are embedded in courses/labs that comprise the program curriculum. Candidate performance evidence is summarized in course grades, and is compiled in considerable detail in their portfolios. Similarly the Impacting Student Learning (ISL) components, which are strategically situated within designated courses in each program, provide proficiency evidence that contributes to course grade determinations and the candidate's portfolio. Different evaluative questions will prompt examination of different arrays of candidate performance evidence. The electronic data

base created to compile and store individual candidate's INTASC related scores, lab performance, professional qualities, and ISL scores by course can be aggregated in varied ways to represent class and cohort proficiencies, patterns related to the INTASC standards, and by extension program quality. Individual portfolios provide even more detailed and elaborated evidence of proficiencies, specific patterns of strengths and weaknesses, areas of particular growth and development within the program, and areas of stability—seemingly unaffected by program specific interventions. As Scannell (2000) notes evidence compiled in assessment systems will be of interest to different audiences and at varying levels of detail. The capacity to manipulate compiled evidence in varied ways, in relation to varied factors, and at different levels of aggregation enhances the utility of the assessment system to inform performance and program evaluation.

With regard to program evaluation the assessment system accommodates inferences from candidate performance evidence, program enrollment patterns, and graduates' employment rates to program quality. The more direct evidence sources include the various perception and satisfaction surveys as well as the periodic formal program reviews by external approval and accrediting agencies. By administering varied perceptual surveys during every semester of PDS implementation a continual data stream is created through which effects of program and personnel changes as well as the impact of environmental forces can be detected and tracked. The PDSN Perception Survey has been quite sensitive, for example, to changes in participating university faculty, perceptions of candidates' preparedness relative to their cohort status (first, second, third semester), and external (particularly political) environmental forces affecting P-12 education.

The following examples illuminate this point. With regard to personnel changes, secondary PDS faculty survey data became significantly more positive when both university coordinators changed. The replacement faculty made a concerted effort to strengthen communications with and among the secondary PDS building coordinators and to ensure coordination of placements, seminars, and meetings across all five secondary PDSs. From the first administration of the survey PDS teachers responses demonstrated patterns of difference in their assessments of candidates' preparedness depending on candidates' cohort (longevity in the program) standing. With some refinements in the survey instrument we have been able to track this pattern of differentiation and have found it to be consistent across teachers' and candidates' survey responses. In the spring of 2000 the new governor proposed a sweeping education reform agenda, promoting it in part by blaming teachers for the state's poor scoring (relative to other states) on norm-referenced tests, and excluding them from participating in building the reform agenda.

During the semester when this was happening the PDS Perceptual Survey ratings on items related to school climate and teachers' willingness to work with candidates dropped significantly. Investigating the negative survey results revealed considerable anxiety on the part of teachers related to the governor's reforms, not dissatisfaction with the PDS program. Candidates' ratings of the same items declined also. This was due to their sensing the teachers' anxiety and misunderstanding it as lack of interest and enthusiasm for having the candidates in their schools and classrooms. This episode provided an opportunity for bolstering inter-institutional support and collaboration. It also highlighted the importance of monitoring data and investigating the sources

influencing perceptions that are reflected in the data prior to drawing conclusions from the data and planning action based on those conclusions.

Assessment as inquiry emphasizes the integral link between processes and outcomes. Within the context of the assessment system this view of assessment encourages critical examination of processes and deliberate actions undertaken in pursuit of collective goals, both within and across the categories of performance, processes, and program. Performance scores such as those provided in the appendices of this paper summarize candidates' improvement from mid-term to final evaluation in the Apprenticeship, or summarize evidence of P-12 student progress and achievement as recorded in sample ISLs. These score summaries reveal nothing about what processes, ways of thinking about and using knowledge informed candidates' progress and learning. When candidates' entire ISL reports are reviewed, evidence of their thinking, their attention to students' agency in learning, and their own questions and concerns as they worked through the instructional unit are illuminated. These reports document the working knowledge candidates are employing in their instructional work. They illuminate both the distinct personal sense-making of individual candidates as well as shared understandings that are being enacted. Assessment as inquiry requires this looking within learning performances and behind summary scores in order to comprehend and appreciate more fully the dimensions and quality of the learning outcome as evidence of learner agency. Candidates are encouraged by faculty to review these documents as a basis for examining their learning, how they are comprehending and applying it, and how it is shaping their professional identities. Within the "Teaching for Understanding" framework this strategy reflects the on-going and recursive qualities of

assessment in the learning process (Wiske 1998). It begins to approximate Delandshere's (2002) inquiry metaphor for assessment.

Assessment as inquiry serves a similar role in both the program and process categories of the assessment system. In the process category, for example, the NCATE PDS Standards serve as a framework for undertaking, recording and reviewing the quality of our collaborative processes. The narratives generated by each PDS in the 2000 self--evaluation are revealing of how faculty within each PDS comprehended and prioritized the standards, and how they categorized their work in relation to them. The narratives reveal commonalities as well as distinctions across the PDSs regarding their perceptions of the emerging collaboration with the university. These in turn provide a basis for systematic inquiry into how institutional climate and its professional culture influence its participation in an inter-institutional partnership.

For the educator preparation unit, conceptualizing assessment as inquiry as well as evaluation affords an opportunity for defining and pursuing with P-12 partners an extensive applied research agenda. The PDSN environment can distinctively support examining contextual and cultural influences on and interactions with performance development and quality, on inter-institutional collaborations, and on enactments of educator preparation program elements. All of these are as yet inadequately understood dimensions of educator preparation and professional practice; and often left unexamined in traditional research.

Assessment Informing and Transforming Practice

As Stiggins, Weisenbach, and Stroble note the development, implementation and full utilization of a comprehensive assessment system are likely to challenge well-

entrenched traditions. Stiggins suggests that deliberate, concerted attention to assessment of candidate performances would itself be a major innovation in educator preparation, and that the introduction of an assessment system would signal a transformational threshold in higher education. Weisenbach and Stroble both suggest that by including all key stakeholders in developing the assessment system individuals relinquish exclusive and private prerogatives in defining course expectations, teaching practices, standards and performance requirements. In this work for example, in order to convey to candidates that field experiences were an integral component of program course-work university faculty determined that field experience performances had to carry substantial weight in the calculation of course grades. This determination necessitated more substantive collaboration between university and PDS-based faculty regarding program/course content, candidate performance expectations, and opportunities for candidates to undertake required tasks in the lab settings. As this work progressed the PDS-based faculty identified a professional development agenda through which they could enrich their own understandings and skills for this more intensive responsibility with educator preparation candidates. This self-assessment much like the individual PDS self-evaluations in 2000 revealed much about the views of the PDS partners regarding both the collaborative partnership and program enactment. Over time assessment has increasingly become an integrated component of the unit's work, informing, challenging, and bridging performance, process, and program focused endeavors. Most significantly, assessment has eventuated in greater openness and more substantive engagement of participants in the educator preparation partnership. This has created opportunities for

PDSN faculty to assume leadership roles, and to examine more deeply issues of practice with university colleagues.

Challenges

Developing and sustaining a comprehensive assessment system requires commitment of resources—human, time, financial. These require an institutional and unit commitment to this endeavor as integral to the distinct mission of educator preparation. External accreditation and program approval standards can partially leverage this work, but they will not serve as a stable foundation. Commitment to and advocacy for such a system by participating university and school partners alike are pivotal. Developing the assessment system described in this paper was accomplished primarily through reallocation of existing resources and strategic planning, and revised procedures. The system continues to be challenged by less than adequate resources that would support more timely data compilation, dissemination and analysis to inform refinements and revisions across the program, process, and performance categories. Creative staff redeployment might well address this challenge. In periods of reduced resources competing priorities can constrict fully implementing and sustaining a comprehensive assessment system. Creative stewardship accompanying unwavering commitment are required to stay the course during such periods.

The culture of higher education does not readily embrace systematic assessment, traditional recognition and reward systems are not well structured to acknowledge the energy and attention such systems demand of faculty, and faculty seldom come to the enterprise well prepared or positively disposed to it. To the extent that developing and

sustaining a comprehensive unit assessment system is pursued with integrity it will face cultural, resource, and competing priority challenges.

Forces in the political arena pose the most daunting challenges to systematic assessment, as well as essential revisions in educator preparation as represented in the NCATE 2000 Unit Standards. The program described in this paper resides in a public university that is governed by a university system Board of Regents. It is Regents' policy that public university educator preparation programs must be NCATE accredited. Private colleges and universities do not come under the purview of the Board of Regents, and the state certification agency which also approves educator preparation programs does not require all programs to meet NCATE Standards. Over the last two years this same agency has itself become a purveyor of an alternative route to certification. In practice this three tiered system disadvantages the public universities. The standards they must meet require considerable resource investment and may more rigorously limit access to their programs. Standards then, particularly in periods of teacher shortages, become in the parlance of the political arena "unnecessary barriers" to "promising individuals" who might otherwise be interested in pursuing careers in education. Simultaneously, public universities are expected to increase their capacity for candidates, and their funding is at least partially based on FTE. The lack of consistent standards and expectations for all educator preparation programs in a state can undermine those held to more rigorous, evidence-based standards.

A second challenge to comprehensive assessment systems posed within the political arena is the current inclination to utilize a single measure to evaluate candidate performance and program quality. Recently adopted federal regulations exemplify this

phenomenon. In this environment, there is a certain economy if not wisdom (albeit cynical) in investing limited resources in test preparation activities and foregoing multi-faceted, comprehensive assessment systems. These challenges do not bode well for improvements in educator preparation, candidate proficiency, P-12 student learning and achievement. Left unchallenged these forces will completely undermine the goals of the NCATE 2000 Unit Standards, and the work of NCATE members and affiliates.

The NCATE 2000 Unit Standards, themselves, challenge educator preparation units. To enrich their curriculum by fully integrating theory and practice, to collaborate substantively with P-12 colleagues, and, through the assessment system standard, to provide extensive evidence of the quality of their graduates and the positive effects their programs have on education practitioners and P-12 student learning and achievement. The assessment system described in this paper illustrates one unit's efforts to meet this challenge. Through this assessment system data from multiple sources affirm and substantiate evaluative judgments regarding candidates' performances, program quality, and process effectiveness. The assessment system facilitates critical review of the unit's work in relation to clearly articulated standards and in light of performance-based evidence. It is complex, demanding of time resources and most importantly commitment. It holds considerable promise for contributing to the quality of education practitioners and ultimately to the enrichment of P-12 student learning and achievement.

References

Bullough, R. V. Jr., Hobbs, S. F., Kauchak, D. P., Crow, N. A., & Stokes, D. (1997). Long-term PDS development in research universities and the clinicalization of teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education 48 (2), 85-95.

Cooper, M. G. (1998). Building a collaborative that will last. Teaching and Change 6 (1), 64-78.

Cooper, M. G., Thornton, H. J., & Eisenman, J. G. (2001). Three years hence: The CSRA P-16 PDS Network initiative. Georgia P-16 in Action3(1), 14-16.

Delandshere, G. (2002). Assessment as inquiry. Teachers College Record 104 (7), 1461-1485.

Gitlin, A. (1992). Teachers' voices for school change. New York: Routledge.

Joyce, B. & Showers, B. (1996). The evolution of peer coaching. Educational Leadership, 53 (6).

Lather, P. (1986). Research as praxis. Harvard Educational Review, 56 (3), 257-277.

Lieberman, A. & Miller, L. (1992). Teacher development in professional practice schools. In M. Levine (Ed.), Professional practice schools: Linking teacher education and school reform (pp. 105-123). New York: Teachers College Press.

Lieberman, A. (Ed.). (1988). Building a professional culture in schools. New York: Teachers College Press.

Little, J. W. (1988). Assessing the prospects for teacher leadership. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), Building a professional culture in schools. New York: Teachers College Press.

Model Standards for Beginning Teacher Licensing and Development.(1992). Council of

Chief State School Officers: Interstate New Teacher Assessment & Support Consortium

NCATE 2000 Unit Standards.

NCATE Standards for Professional Development Schools—Draft 1997.

NCATE Standards for Professional Development Schools—2001.

Perkins, D. (1998). What is understanding? In M.S. Wiske (Ed.), Teaching for understanding: Linking research with practice. (pp. 39-59). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Perrone, V. (Ed.). (1991). Expanding student assessment. Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Perrone, V. (1998). Why do we need a pedagogy of understanding? In M.S. Wiske (Ed.), Teaching for understanding: Linking research with practice. (pp. 13-38). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Scannell, D. P. (2000). Aggregating data for NCATE 2000. Washington, D. C.: NCATE.

Schalock, H. D. (1998) "Effective teachers please, Mr. Wise, quality is not enough".

Schön, D. A. (1991). The reflective turn: Case studies in and on educational practice. New York: Teachers College Press.

Stiggins, R. J. (2000). Specifications for a performance-based assessment system for teacher preparation. Washington, D. C.: NCATE.

Stroble, B. (2000). Unit Assessment Systems. Washington, D.C.: NCATE.

Stoddart, T. (1993). The professional development school: Building bridges between cultures. Educational Policy 7 (1), 5-23.

Thom, A. R. (1998). Professional development schools and the destabilization of faculty

work. ERIC Document: ED 420297.

Thompson, S. (2001). Master teacher selection. Georgia P-16 in Action 3 (1), 6-7.

Weisenbach, E. L. (2000). Making the case: Marshaling evidence about candidate proficiency. Washington, D. C.: NCATE.

Wiggins, G. (1995). Curricular coherence and assessment: Making sure that the effect matches the intent. Toward a coherent curriculum: The 1995 ASCD yearbook 101-119. Alexandria, Va: The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Wiggins, G. (1993). Assessing student performance: Exploring the purpose and limits of testing. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wilson, S. M., Floden, R. E., & Ferrini-Mundi, J. (2001). Teacher preparation research: Current knowledge, gaps, and recommendations. University of Washington: Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.

Wiske, M. S. (Ed.). (1998). Teaching for understanding: Linking research with practice. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

APPENDIX A
Professional Development School Network Profile
2002

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOL NETWORK PROFILE--2002

PDS Demographic Diversity:

Urban:	**Rural:**	**Suburban:**
Elementary: 6	Elementary: 5	Elementary: 5
Middle: 2	Middle: 1	Middle: 2
Secondary: 2	Secondary: 1	Secondary: 2

Title I:

Elementary: 7 Middle: 2 Secondary: 0

Fully half of all the PDSs (13) have student populations in which 40% or more students are eligible for free or reduced lunch.

Ethnicity: Majority Minority: 13 Majority White: 13

In only three of the schools the "minority" population is less than 20% of the entire student population.

Elementary PDS Achievement Indicators: *3 PDSs do not have grades above 3rd.

4th Grade CRCT*	Reading	Lang.Arts	Math
# 70% passing	11/13	12/13	7/13
# improving from 2000	10/13	9/13	4/13
# at or above state average	11/13	11/13	10/13

5th Grade Writing*

80% at or above 11/13
Stage 4 (6 Stage Scale)
State average was 80%

improving from 2000 7/13

Middle PDS Achievement Indicators:

6th Grade CRCT	Reading	Lang. Arts	Math
# 70% passing	5/5	3/5	3/5
# improving from 2000	4/5	4/5	4/5
# at or above state average	3/5	3/5	3/5
8th Grade CRCT			
# 70% passing	5/5	4/5	2/5
# improving from 2000	5/5	4/5	4/5
# at or above state average	4/5	4/5	4/5

8th Grade Writing

80% at or above "On Target" 5/5
average above state 4/5
improving from 2000 5/5

Secondary PDS Achievement Indicators:

GHSGT	Eng.	Math	SS	Sci	AllComp.	Wrtg.
# 90% passing on 1st admin.	5/5	4/5	2/5	0/5	0/5	2/5
# 80% passing on 1st admin.	5/5	5/5	3/5	2/5	2/5	5/5
# improving from 2000	3/5	2/5	2/5	3/5	3/5	3/5
# at or above State average	4/5	3/5	3/5	2/5	2/5	2/5

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX B
Impacting Student Learning Components, Schedule, Rubric
Sample Data, Spring 2002

Impacting Student Learning--Elements of the ISL Component

Student Profiles:
Developmental characteristics
Background and experience
School, classroom, community contexts
Learning styles, abilities, needs
Interviews of students, teachers, others

Assessment of Student Learning:
Tools
Processes
Pre & post
Formative & summative
Authentic
Connections to standards

Standards for Students: Learning:
(QCCs, National Content Standards, Stanford 9)
Content Understanding
Type of learning task: knowledge, concept, skill, application, theory, disposition
Thinking processes
Outcomes, goals and objectives

Evaluation of Student Learning:
Artifacts
Analysis
Explanation

Standards for Teachers: Pedagogy:
(Conceptual Framework/National Board)
Developmentally appropriate
Multiple paths to learning/diversity
Cognitively/actively engaging
Performance-based assessments

Reflection on & Refinement of Teaching & Learning:
Continual reflection & refinement during teaching
Final reflection & analysis
Both Include:
Implications for further learning
Refinements/revisions needed
Action plan/next steps

IMPACTING STUDENT LEARNING (ISL) COMPONENTS BY PROGRAM BY LEVEL OF FOCUS

All ISLs are embedded in Content Pedagogy Courses or the culminating Apprenticeship, Semester IV.
Field Experiences comprise five dedicated weeks of each fifteen-week semester.

Certification Program	Individual/ ↓Tutorial	Whole Class Instruction 4-7 Student Focus	Whole Class Instruction Whole Class Focus	Varied Levels of Focus Multiple Examples
Early Childhood Program (PK-5)	Semester I: Math content focus, 1-3 students, 3 weeks	Semester II: Science content focus, 4-7 students' performance assessed, 2-4 week unit	Semester III: Social Studies, whole class, 3-4 week unit; & Reading diagnosis-remediation, 2-3 students, 4 weeks	Semester IV: Candidate completes multiple units across varied subject areas, fully integrated into classroom curriculum, jointly determined with master teacher
Middle Grades Program (4-8)	Semester I: Content concentration focus (each candidate pursues 2 content concentrations: Math, Science, Social Studies, Language Arts), assessment focus is on learning processes, four weeks	Semester II: Content concentration focus, whole class performance assessed and Reading diagnosis-remediation tutoring of three students four weeks	Semester III: Interdisciplinary focus, whole class performance assessed, five weeks	Semester IV: Candidate completes multiple units across content concentration areas, fully integrated into classroom curriculum, jointly determined with master teacher
Secondary Programs in single subject majors (7-12)	Semester I: Precedes formal entry to program	Semester II: Certification content field, 4-7 students' performance assessed across multiple classes, 3-4 weeks	Semester III: Certification content field, whole class performance assessed, five weeks	Semester IV: Candidate completes multiple units within certification content field, fully integrated into classroom curriculum, jointly determined with master teacher

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOL NETWORK
Impacting Student Learning
Scoring Rubric Criteria

4 = **exemplary** performance on all components of ISL task -- goals are well-stated and appropriate for grade level/subject and students; learning profiles are well-developed, complete, and accurate; diagnosis of student needs is based on data; instructional practices and strategies are active, student-centered, and appropriate to diagnosed needs and the task; assessments are appropriate for the type of learning being assessed; reflections reveal reasoned and supported analysis of lessons, student achievement, and future needs; there is explicit evidence of understanding of students as learners; writing and/or speaking are clear, strong, and thoughtful; references and examples are integrated into the analysis; consistently correct usage of standard English, consistent and accurate use of APA style.

3 = **proficient** performance on all components of ISL task -- goals are appropriate for grade-level; learning profiles give an adequate but not complete insights; diagnosis of student needs is based on accurate but insufficient data; instructional practices and strategies are subject-centered and appropriate to the task; assessments address the learning task(s); reflections reveal well-supported analysis of lessons and student achievement; there is some evidence of understanding of students as learners; writing and/or speaking are clear and coherent; some evidence of integration of references and examples; consistently correct usage of standard English, consistent and accurate use of APA style.

2 = efforts to address all components of ISL task are **in progress**; performance on all dimensions of task is not completely accurate or coherent -- goals are related to content; learning profiles are insufficient for accurate planning; planning is superficial and lacks thoughtfulness; instructional practices and strategies are subject- or teacher-centered and don't fit well with objectives; reflections and analysis are descriptive and superficial rather than reasoned and supported; references are dropped-in rather than integrated; inconsistencies in correct usage of standard English, inconsistent and inaccurate use of APA style.

1= performance is **unsatisfactory;** not all areas are addressed; performance is inaccurate, incoherent, lacks clarity – goals are incomplete or poorly stated or inappropriate; profiles are incomplete and/or inaccurate; planning is minimal; instructional practices and strategies are not thoughtful or well planned, inappropriate to content focus and/or learners; reflections and analysis are not at all evident; faulty reasoning; consistently incorrect usage of standard English, consistently inaccurate use of APA style.

IMPACTING STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

Rating Scale:
4 – Exemplary level
3 – Proficient level
2 – In progress level
1 – Unsatisfactory level

CFP – CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK
PRINCIPLES ADAPTED FROM INTASC

Student:_____ **Program:**_____ **Block:**_____ **Course:**_____

1. **Learning Goals:** _____ **(CFP – 1)**

- Designates goals in terms of knowledge, skills, theory concepts, and dispositions.
- Describes the goals and how they represent the above categories.
- Embeds content.

2. **Learning Profiles:** _____ **(CFP – 2, 3)**

- Includes profile of each student as a learner (developmental characteristics, strengths, weaknesses, learning styles, outside variables, experience, prior knowledge).
- Describe implication of the learner profiles for teaching.
- Describe learning context and its implications for teaching.
- Provides evidence in support of profiles.

3. **Planning for learning:** _____ **(CFP – 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)**

- Describes diagnostic assessment:
  - Instrument/Performances
  - Student data
  - Implications for teaching
- Uses effective lesson planning:
  - Objective (s)
  - Assessment
  - Procedures
- Evidences appropriate teaching practices
  - Variety
  - Critical creative thinking, problem-solving
  - Appropriate communication and technology
  - Support learning of all students
  - Positive social interaction
  - Active student engagement

4. **Student Achievement:** _____ **(CFP – 8)**

- Describes formative assessments:
  - Instruments/Performances
  - Student achievement data
  - Describes needed student intervention areas
  - Implications for teaching
- Describes summative assessment:
  - Instruments/Performances
  - Student achievement data
  - Analyzes the "why" related to achievement
  - Implications for teaching

5. **Reflection and Refinement:** _____ **(CFP – 9)**

- Reflects upon own instruction and the impact on student achievement.
- Indicates next steps for instruction with each learner profiled.

Overall Score _____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Preliminary ISL Evidence of Teacher Candidate Ability to Support P-12 Students' Achievement

Fall 2001: ECED 4313—Reading Diagnosis and Remediation

Summary data on tutorial outcomes for 49 elementary students in PDSs, grades K-5, tutored by teacher candidates. Data are based on student pre-tutoring and post-tutoring scores on the Informal Reading Inventory (IRI).

	Change for Entire Sample	Change for Improved Group
Independent Reading Level	1.37*	2.4*
Instructed Reading Level	1.55*	2.05*

*Average Reading Level Increase

	%Increase	%Same	%Decrease
Independent Reading Level	57%	37%	6%
Instructed Reading Level	76%	18%	4%

Percents represent percent of 49 students in each category of change from pre to post-tutoring assessment. Tutoring period was @4 weeks, approximately two hours a week per student.

Spring 2002: MGED 3222—Integrated Reading to Learn

Summary data on tutorial outcomes for 15 middle level students in PDSs, grades 6-8, tutored by teacher candidates. Data are based on student pre-tutoring and post-tutoring scores on the Informal Reading Inventory (IRI).

	Pre-tutoring Average	Post-tutoring Average	#Improving
Word Recognition Independent Level	4.8	6.1	10
Word Recognition Instructional Level	6.4	6.8	6
Comprehension Independent Level	5.4	6.5	9
Comprehension Instructional Level	6.1	6.8	7

The IRI does not reflect scores above the 8th grade level; a number of students scored at that level on the pre-tutorial assessment, so there are not post-tutoring scores available for them. Tutoring took place during the 4--week intensive lab period of spring 2002; in a number of instances tutoring was precluded for SAT-9 test preparation.

Spring 2002: MGED 3241—Mathematics Pedagogy

Summary data were only available from two students' Impacting Student Learning reports. In one the average score on the pre-assessment was 37.42; while the post-assessment score average was 87.98. In the other ISL, of the 16 students in the class, 12 realized increased post-test scores, two remained the same, two declined. Of the 12 whose scores increased, 9 increased by 50% or more.

Spring 2002: SCED 4401—Secondary Science Pedagogy I

One candidate's ISL included pre and post assessment error rates on two pairs of comparison classes:

Pair I:	Average # missed 13.8	8.33
	Average # correct 11.635	16.66
Pair II:	Average # missed 12.364	6.394
	Average # correct 12.636	18.606

Spring 2002: ECED 3231—Science Pedagogy I

In this course teacher candidates taught a whole class unit, and monitored the pre and post instructional assessments of five particular students for the Impacting Student Learning component. The units were fully integrated within the science curriculum of the class in which the teacher candidate was completing her/his lab assignment. The following are representative summaries from teacher candidates' post-ISL documentation.

	Pre-assessment	Post-Assessment
Candidate I:		
Topic 1:	4 = 100% correct 1 = 2 errors	5 = 100% correct
Topic 2:	4 = 100% correct 1 = 1 error	5 = 100% correct
Topic 3:	0 = 100% correct 2 = 3 errors; 2 = 2 errors 1 = 1 error	5 = 100% correct
Candidate II:		
Student 1:	1 correct	5 correct
2:	1 correct	5 correct
3:	3.5 correct	5 correct
4:	4 correct	5 correct
Candidate III:		
Topic 1:	10% correct	80% correct
Topic 2:	20% correct	80% correct
Topic 3:	60% correct	100% correct
(%s are class average of correct answers)		
Candidate IV:		
Student 1:	5 errors	1 error
Student 2:	2 errors	0 errors
Student 3:	4 errors	1 error
Student 4:	0 errors	4 errors
Student 5:	0 errors	0 errors
Candidate V:		
Student 1:	15	43
Student 2:	30	50
Student 3:	10	50
Student 4:	20	37
Student 5:	10	41

(This assessment included ten items, each worth five points for a total of 50 possible points. Data represent points earned by each student on the pre-test and the post-test.)

Spring 2002: MGED 4210—Apprenticeship, Pre and Post assessments on six Impacting Student Learning Units completed by six Apprentices.

Content focus	Pre-assessment Mean	Post-assessment Mean	Grade
Geometry	17.6%	89.6%	7th
Geometry	34.5%	83.8%	7th
Quadrilaterals & Polygons	17%	75%	8th
Invertebrates	62.8%	83.7%	7th
Astronomy	45.6%	89.3%	8th
Literature (Diary of Ann Frank)	28%	83%	8th

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX C
Apprentice Mid-term and Final Evaluation Summaries

Apprentice Mean Scores (1-4 scale) by Program on Conceptual Framework Principles

Baseline data for 2001-2002 academic year. Sample of 20% or greater for each program

CF Principles	ECED		MGED		SCED	
	midterm	final	Midterm	final	midterm	final
10	3.44	3.87	3.28	3.70	3.88	4
7, 9	3.13	3.74	2.91	3.63	3.28	3.66
1, 2, 3, 4,6	3.24	3.79	2.64	3.57	3.25	3.61
5	3.21	3.76	3.14	3.57	3.25	3.72
8	3.03	3.68	2.71	3.68	3.35	3.70

Percentage of apprentices by program with score increase from midterm to final

CF Principles	ECED	MGED	SCED
10	90	100	50
7. 9	90	100	100
1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	90	100	100
5	90	87.5	100
8	90	100	50

Percentage of apprentices by program with a score of proficient (3) or above at final

CF Principles	ECED	MGED	SCED
10	100	100	100
7, 9	100	100	100
1, 2, 3, 4, 6	100	100	100
5	100	100	100
8	100	100	100

Percentage of apprentices by program with an exemplary score (4) at final

CF Principles	ECED	MGED	SCED
10	60	0	100
7, 9	50	25	25
1, 2, 3, 4, 6	60	12.5	25
5	60	12.5	0
8	50	37.5	25

Gains of apprentices from midterm to final by program

CF Principles	ECED	MGED	SCED
10	.43	.42	.12
7, 9	.61	.72	.38
1, 2, 3, 4, 6	.55	.93	.36
5	.55	.43	.47
8	.65	.97	.35

A MULTI-FACETED ASSESSMENT SYSTEM
in a
COLLABORATIVE EDUCATOR PREPARATION MODEL:
Performance, Processes, Programs

Mary Gendernalik Cooper
Visiting Professor
Center for Educational Leadership, Innovation and Policy
College of Education, San Diego State University
Phone: 706-869-8683; e-mail: coopermg@aol.com

For the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Annual Meeting
24-27 January 2003, New Orleans, LA

APPENDIX D
Professional Development School Network—Self-Study 2000
Composite Summary Scores for PDS Functions and NCATE Draft Standards

PDSNI—Self—Evaluation using NCATE DRAFT PDS STANDARDS (1997)
1998—2000

Composite Scores (1-3 Scale) for Four PDS Functions

PDS Function	1 Parallel	2 Cooperation	3 Collaboration
Educator Preparation			3
Professional Development		2.6	
Research & Inquiry	1.6		
Support P-12 Student Learning		2.5	

Composite Scores(1-4 Scale) for Five Draft Standards

STANDARD	1 Beginning	2 Developing	3 Acceptable	4 Target
I. Learning Community (5)		2.2		
II. Accountability & Quality Assurance (5)		2.46		
III. Collaboration (3)		2.8		
IV. Diversity (3)		2.47		
V. Structures, Resources, and Roles (4)		2.73		

( )=Number of discrete elements in Standard for which a score is calculated.

PDSNI—Self—Evaluation using NCATE DRAFT PDS STANDARDS (1997)
1998—2000

Composite Scores on Elements making up the NCATE DRAFT Standards

Standard Elements	1 Beginning	2 Developing	3 Acceptable	4 Target
I. Learning Community				
Support Learners		2.7		
Inquiry-based Practice	1.5			
Shared Professional Vision &Grounded Knowledge Base		2.7		
Serve as Instrument of Change		2		
Extended Learning Community		2.2		
II. Accountability & Quality Assurance				
Develop Professional Accountability		2.3		
Assure Public Accountability	1.5			
Set PDS Participation Criteria			3.2	
Develop Assessments, Collect Information and Use Results			3	
Engage with the PDS Context		2.3		
III. Collaboration				
Engage in Joint Work		2.7		
Design Roles & Structures to Enhance Collaboration & Develop Parity		2.7		
Systematically Recognize & Celebrate Joint Work & Contributions of Each			3	
IV. Diversity				
Ensure Equitable Opportunities to Learn		2.6		
Evaluate Policies & Practices to Support Equitable Learning Outcomes	1.5			
Recruit & Support Diverse Participants			3.3	
V. Structures, Resources & Roles				
Establish Governance & Support Structures		2.2		
Ensure Progress toward Goals		2.7		
Create PDS Roles			3	
Use Effective Communication			3	

Composite scores are based on review of 26 of 28 PDS Self-studies, completed in spring 2000.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Multifaceted Assessment System in a Collaborative Educator Preparation Model: Performance, Processes, Programs	
Author(s): Mary GENDERNALIK-COOPER, Ph.D.	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☒

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature:	Printed Name/Position/Title: Mary Gendernalik-Cooper Visiting Professor
Organization/Address: Center for Educational Leadership, Innovation & Policy, San Diego State University	Telephone: FAX:
	E-Mail Address: Date: 5 Dec. 2002

(over)

CLEARINGHOUSE ON TEACHING
AND TEACHER EDUCATION

ERIC

November 4, 2002

Dear AACTE Presenter:

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education invites you to contribute to the ERIC database by providing us with a copy of your paper that will be presented at AACTE's 55th Annual Meeting, (January 24-27, 2003, New Orleans, LA). Abstracts of documents that are accepted by ERIC are available through computers in both on-line and CD/ROM versions. The ERIC database is accessed worldwide and is used by teachers, administrators, researchers, students, policymakers, and others with an interest in education.

AACTE
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION
1307
NEW YORK AVE. NW
SUITE 300
WASHINGTON DC
20005-4701
202/293-2450
FAX 202/457-8095

Inclusion of your work provides you with a permanent archive and contributes to the overall development of materials in ERIC. The full text of your contribution will be accessible through microfiche collections that are housed at libraries throughout the country and through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. Documents are reviewed and accepted based on their contribution to education, timeliness, relevance, methodology, effectiveness of presentation, and reproduction quality.

To disseminate your work through ERIC, you will need to complete and sign the **Reproduction Release Form** located on the back of this letter and return it with a letter-quality copy of your paper. Please mail all materials to: **The ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education, 1307 New York Ave., N.W., Suite 300, Washington, D.C. 20005.** Please feel free to photocopy the release form for future or additional submissions.

Should you have further questions, please contact me at 1-800-822-9229; or E-mail: lkelly@aacte.org.

Sincerely,

Linda M. Kelly
Acquisitions and Outreach Coordinator

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: info@ericfac.piccard.csc.com
WWW: http://ericfacility.org